

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response the Office Action dated December 7, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 12-21 are currently pending, with claims 1, 13 and 18 being independent.

Claims 13, 18 and 19 are amended. No new matters have been added.

Allowable subject matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication in item 2 of the Office Action that claims 1 and 12 are allowed. Further, Applicant acknowledges that claims 14, 19 and 21 are allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The base claims 13 and 18 are amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 2nd paragraph and now in condition for allowance. Thus, applicant believes claims 14, 19 and 21, being dependent upon allowable base claims 13 and 18, are also in condition for allowance. Therefore, the objection should be respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claims 13 and 18 are now substantially identical to Japanese Allowable claims 4 and 9. Please note that US claims 18 and 19 are combined to Japanese claim 9.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 13 and 18 are now complete. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 13, 15-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Granville* (U.S. Patent No. 5,006,846) in view of *Shannon* (U.S. Patent No. 7,157,710). The rejection is respectfully traversed at least the following reasons set forth below.

It is respectfully submitted that *Shannon* is not a proper reference that can be applied against the claims. *Shannon*, which is relied in the ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, is not available as a prior art reference against the present Application. The present Application has a PCT filing date of October 29, 2004 and a foreign application priority date of November 4, 2003, which is prior to the filing date of *Shannon*, which has a non-provisional filing date of November 12, 2004 and a provisional filing date of November 19, 2003. Accordingly, *Shannon* is not prior art which may be used as a reference for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. This rejection is therefore respectfully traversed. A certified translation of priority documents for the present Application is herewith submitted.

As for *Granville*, it discloses an electric power line phase conductor (line) monitoring system in which a single measuring station can measure all the power parameters of voltage and current and phase angle plus ambient and line temperatures.

To constitute anticipation of the claimed invention under U.S. practice, the prior art reference must literally or inherently teach each and every limitation of the claims. Further, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the following three criteria must be satisfied.

First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

Finally, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Here, in this case, *Granville* does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations with particular emphasis on the limitation “*corona discharge detection means*” as recited in claim 13 and “*calculating a corona discharge start voltage*” in claim 18. Such limitations and the superior results obtained therefrom are not at all taught or suggested in *Granville*. At least for these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, claims 15-17, being dependent upon allowable base claim 13, are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is therefore courteously solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SNB-0001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: March 6, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Tomoko Nakajima/

Tomoko Nakajima

Registration No.: L0231

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorney for Applicant